The spiritual transformation of mankind cannot be hurried, let alone brought to fruition in one generation. —CARL JUNG

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 53 JANUARY, 1965 NUMBER 3

ACCESS TO THE FUTURE

WE enter now the year that will contain the ninetieth anniversary of the founding of the Theosophical Movement in the nineteenth century. If the past is any measure of the happenings of the future, there will be, before too long, another flood tide and acceleration of human development—a period of resurgence gathering into the common progress of mankind those elements of perception, ideas, and attitudes which, a little less than a century ago, were strange and even alien novelties to the world of serious thought. The psycho-moral evolution of mankind moves in a spiral, from plateau to plateau, and there comes a time when, as Buckle remarked, truths once hotly contested "are looked upon as commonplace facts, and a little later there comes another period in which they are declared to be necessary, and even the dullest intellect wonders how they could ever have been denied."

So it may be with those deeper conceptions of the nature of man, the profound meanings in myth and allegory, and the idea of an inner—inner, if not transcendent—self, which are slowly taking hold in the best thought of the age, and becoming the key to decisive reflections on the human condition.

These ideas are obtaining currency in a living, not an engrafted, vocabulary. They represent, in the *Secret Doctrine* phrase, "The evolution of the God-idea," even though the word "God" may be hardly mentioned. It is progress indeed for men to discuss the most crucial issues in human life, yet find no need to use this term at all.

It is as though there were intuitive recognition that any talk of "God," these days, cannot help but signify a denigration of Man. It is also a denigration of Deity. "Initiates," it is said, "never use the word 'God' to designate the One and Secondless Principle in the Universe." What is at issue now, and is always at issue in a time of spiritual crisis, is spoken of in the continuation of this passage:

> Between speculative Atheism and idiotic anthropomorphism there must be a philosophical mean, and a reconciliation. The Presence of the Unseen Principle throughout all nature, and the highest manifestation of it on earth—MAN, can alone help to solve the Problem, which is that of the mathematician whose *x* must ever elude the grasp of our terrestrial algebra. (*S.D.* II, 555.)

The point, here, is that God and Man (in the highest sense) are identical, and that when separated in idea, these two conceptions are in continual stress, each seeking to diminish the other. If God is both separate and all, then man is a nothing—as indeed our more extreme theologies insist. And as the stature of man grows in human understanding, the outside God must be diminished, and in the end abolished, when the godlike in man is finally restored.

The God of theology is worse than "attacked" in the new thinking about man; "He" is left out as irrelevant—a kind of forgotten shadow, unnecessary even to mention. A higher kind of pragmatism in this thought turns attention to the potentialities of Self, for these, men are learning from experience, are the source of all the desirable qualities in human beings.

It is inevitable, with such changes in the dynamics of philosophical reflection, that popular "morality" should also change. The argument for human betterment is no longer from patterns of conformity, but from psychological attitudes and states which make possible generous and self-reliant lives. And, naturally enough, considerable confusion results, for not only are there unmeasured excesses as men move from old to new criteria of action, but also ambitious imitators of the new spirit appear, hoping to trap the spontaneous expressions of the awakening in a net of clichés. It has always been thus, and more so than ever, today, when self-consciousness is the keynote, and new-born truth has little more than its subtlety to give it identification.

What can save these rare fruits of the cycle? There is only one thing to do. These deepening perceptions work. There is high chal-

lenge in the circumstances of the world of our time. There is need for social invention, for the introduction of psychological insight to problems that can never be solved according to old, external formulas, and need for the courage to live in ways that will create new, freer institutions for the future.

These, surely, are the changes which lie ahead. But even as the growth in attitude and philosophy has come unmarked and unannounced, even undevised and unexpected; so, also, more than likely, will come the applications and evolutions of this new moral energy in the affairs of men.

The Theosophical Movement has its own unconscious as well as its conscious servants and collaborators. We can never forget that *all men are souls,* that the springs of the evolutionary tide rise wherever it flows, without distinction, moving in streams that go beyond the sight of ordinary anticipation. A new organism of thought has been slowly coming into being throughout the decades since 1875. The men who belong to the vision which once seemed so distant, so wildly hopeful, so unconcerned with obstacle and limitation, may now have ready access to the world they will help to regenerate for all.

"Creation" of Environment

The recent tendencies of scientific thought lead us to the belief that mind is a greater instrument than was formerly recognised in prescribing the nature and laws of the external world as studied in physical science. In exploring his own territory the physicist comes up against the influence of that wider reality which he cannot altogether shut out, and by its selection of values the mind may indeed be said to have created its physical environment. We have spelt mind with a small "m," for our values are human values; yet we trust there is even in us something that has value for the eternal. Perhaps the actuality of the world is not only in these little sparks from the divine mind which flicker for a few years and are gone, but in the Mind, the Logos.

—Arthur S. Eddington

MISUNDERSTOOD BIBLICAL TRADITIONS

Mercy—II

PRIMITIVE Christianity, which was characterized by healthy diversity of opinion on all great questions of religious doctrine, left each man free to ponder and resolve the issues for himself. But after the Pauline battle for freedom from law, which threatened the authority of the organizational-minded leaders of the Church, Christianity underwent a change. Liberality of thought was no longer encouraged, or even tolerated. Stereotyped dogmas and creeds, which were only to be believed, took the place of living truth, which demands serious thought and questioning.

Meanwhile, Christ's teaching of Mercy, in the "misunderstood Biblical tradition," has become obscure. The questions around which the differences of opinion on mercy have revolved, and which are perennial for every sincere searcher after truth, are these: Is mercy, when it is received, the merited reward for right action, or is it the un-merited gift of Deity, or of grace? Is mercy without justice possible in man's dealings with his fellow men?

According to dictionary definition, "*mercy* implies compassion so great as to enable one to forbear, even when justice demands punishment." From this and other definitions of similar character, people in general seem to have acquired the notion that mercy means non-exercise of the right to punish, or that mercy and justice are opposites. In the minds of many individuals, it implies *favor* from an outside God, whether or not deserved. Indeed, the average human being, when attempting to put these virtues into practice, finds himself faced with what appears to be an irresolvable paradox. How, it is asked, can a person be both merciful and just at the same time? How is the man of religion to walk with one foot according to Moses' law of justice—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—and with the other according to Jesus' law of mercy, love and forgiveness? How many individuals, religious or otherwise, have been able to reconcile Shakespeare's well-known statement that "Mercy seasons justice" with his less-quoted, yet equally cogent, verse that "Mercy but murders, pardoning those who kill"? Failure to comprehend the

true meaning of mercy and to bring it into balance with justice has led to dire results. Religiously-minded individuals, for example, are all too inclined, in time of difficulty, to look to divine favors for relief, whether they merit them or not, or to live in fear that such favors might be withheld. Other kindly disposed people, with the belief they are showing mercy, show only favoritism to one at the expense of another, and thus commit injustices from which they suffer for the remainder of their lives. And worse yet, countless numbers of souls, confounded by what appear to be endless contradictions in their scriptures, give up all efforts at either mercy or justice, look out for themselves, and "let the devil take the hindmost."

Courts of law in civilized countries everywhere are founded upon the principle of equal justice for all, without respect of person. But because of human frailty and man's inability to see and understand all the elements at work in any act of sin or wrong-doing, it is agreed that justice must be tempered by mercy. Yet, one of the most difficult decisions any judge or jury has to make, as any tribunal will attest, is that of determining when and upon whom the tender hand of mercy may be laid with wisdom, equity, and safety. For "misplaced lenity," said Seneca, "is an offense against society." Through long and bitter experience, arbiters of the law have come to confess that some sorts of mercy to the criminal oftentime result in cruelty to the community. It takes a wise judge indeed to know whose sentence to commute and whose to let stand.

A newspaper item of some years back relates the story of a triple tragedy, the outcome in part of a simple act of mercy. A man employed by a religious institution was discharged for stabbing a fellow worker. Through an emotional plea for mercy, he was permitted to retain his room in the institution while seeking work elsewhere. The next day, after brooding over the dismissal, he brutally murdered both the superior who had befriended him and another member of the staff who attempted to intervene. What do occurrences of this kind mean? Is it that men should become hard-hearted realists, unmindful of the teachings of Jesus and other great Saviors to be merciful, kind and forgiving? Do they mean that people should abandon good works and live for themselves alone? Do they imply that when one hears a cry of distress, he should follow the misunderstood Mohammedan tradition and say "Kismet—it is Fate"—and go his way unconcerned? Hardly. They do suggest, however, that the ability to help others in a real sense, without doing harm, is a most

difficult undertaking, and requires a great deal more wisdom than most individuals possess. It suggests that before grasping the nettle of good works and taking the law into one's own hands, it might be well to look more deeply than we have into the mystery of the human heart, to discover if we can why those who suffer are in the condition they are, and to equate these findings with that wise and beneficent Law of Karma which—

> Just though mysterious, leads us on unerring
> Through ways unmarked from guilt to punishment.

The subject of mercy, then, in the opinion of the Theosophist, cannot be properly understood without some acquaintance with the nature and operation of this Law.

Karma is the Sanskrit name adopted by the Theosophists of the last century for the ultimate Law of the Universe. So comprehensive is this law that it governs everything from the vastest solar system to the tiniest atom, from the holiest archangel to the most insignificant infusoria. The birth, life, and death of planets, nations, and families; the physical, intellectual, and moral actions of human beings; and also the seemingly blindest motions in the kingdoms of Nature, are under its sway. Karma is the fundamental Law underlying the laws of physics and chemistry. It is the philosopher's law of cause-and-effect, and also the religious and ethical law of morality, retribution, and justice. "No spot or being in the Universe," it is said, "is exempt from the operation of Karma." Although it embodies the wisdom and compassion of the highest Creative Intelligences, it is not a Being. It is, rather, the universal Law of Harmony, which unerringly restores all disturbance to equilibrium.

Gautama Buddha brought a clear and unequivocal teaching of the Law of Karma. What Jesus hinted at in his saying that "one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled"; what St. Paul intimated in his doctrine that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap"; and what Moses undoubtedly intended in his teaching "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth"—Buddha explained in detail. The heart of Gautama's teaching is beyond doubt the *majesty of the Law*—that blessed Law which moves to Righteousness, "Which none at last can turn aside or stay; / The heart of it, is Love, the end of it / Is Peace and Consummation sweet. Obey!"

But the Occidental mind is not naturally inclined toward metaphysical thought. With concentration centered largely upon the

physical, Westerners tend to interpret everything, even their sacred texts, in the lowest, most material sense. When the concept of Law as applied to Nature is considered, for example, it is usually conceived to mean only those manifestations of order we see about us, the forces which regulate the physical world—the rising and setting of the sun, the sequence of the seasons, the principle of gravitation, and the reliability of the elements. But in Buddha's doctrine of Karma, as expressed in *The Light of Asia*:

> This is its work upon the things ye see:
> The unseen things are more; men's hearts and minds,
> The thoughts of peoples and their ways and wills,
> Those, too, the great law binds.

It is in these higher, unseen manifestations, in the application of Karma to man's thoughts, feelings, attitudes and choices that we shall have to search for an understanding of the true meaning of many of the misunderstood biblical traditions, including both *mercy* and *grace*. For, according to Theosophy, the Laws of Nature are neither mechanical nor unintelligent, but are the reflection in Cosmic Substance of the Thought Divine, the ideation of the seven primeval Elohim or Archangels.

"The kingdom of God," said Jesus, "is within you." (Luke 17:21.) Buddha taught the same thing, saying that Brahm, the SELF, is within all life. Because the SELF is within, he said, Law is likewise within the heart and consciousness of every creature. Each and every action, by whomsoever performed, carries with it, therefore, its own reward or punishment. Each and every tremor of consciousness, whether in the form of thought, feeling, or act, like ripples from the pebble dropped into the pond, goes out to the confines of the Universe, and on return, brings back to the center of disturbance whatever of good or evil any individual experiences. As the magnet attracts steel filings, so does man attract to himself his own self-made destiny. It was beyond doubt the inner God that Moses had in mind when he quoted the Lord as saying: "To me belongeth vengeance, and recompense." (Deut. 32:35.) And it was the Law of Karma, which is rooted in the kingdom of God that Jesus probably referred to when he said, "With what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again." (Matt. 7:2.) The Book of Jeremiah, read symbolically in the light of the *inner* God, is a magnificent treatise on Karma, the Law of Compensation.

The visiting of the infirm is one of the "mercies" incumbent

upon conscientious Christian devotees. And it is true that sympathy, understanding and kind treatment are powerful aids to recovery. But this, like other human amenities, seems to have become perverted. In bringing sorrow into a person's life, Karma does not do so with intent to punish. Karma has no motive of itself. Being impersonal Law, it only follows the lines of causation established by the individual. Karma adjusts effect to cause, and in so doing, arouses the attention of the Ego, revealing the need, if one is introspective, for a truer basis for thought and action. But how can this be done if friends and relatives treat the "victim" as if he has been unjustly attacked by fate? Suffering is a sacred matter to the soul, a time for thought and readjustment. Unwise friends sometimes rob a person of his golden opportunity for learning and readjustment, by trying to relieve him of thinking. And how common it is for friends and relatives, in moments of emotional sympathy, miscalled mercy, to deprive the sufferer of his one chance in this incarnation, perhaps, to learn the lesson he most needs to learn! Those whose interest in the welfare of others is genuine will have little difficulty determining their duty.

Then, too, there is a vast distinction between genuine help to the afflicted—which usually requires sacrifice—and emotional palavering and bedside jokes, which are more often hindrances than aids. Those who know something of the beneficence of Karma stand appalled before the difficult task of helping the afflicted. The first rule of the religious life is that one must fit himself to be the better able to help others, but true fitness requires something more than emotional sympathy. Karma will not keep the sufferer in misery longer than is necessary, no longer than the moment when inner adjustment is made. But Karma *must* be satisfied—ideas must be sifted, feelings tempered, attitude enlarged—and no one but the sufferer can do it. If proper inner adjustment is not made in time of trial, any relief obtained will be only temporary and the experience will have to be repeated, either in this or another life. Heartless though the statement may appear, once the sufferer's needs have been cared for, he may well be left to himself, to ponder the causes for his ailment.

Lest the above statements be misunderstood, and Theosophists be accused of being cold and unmerciful, it may be well to recall H. P. Blavatsky's definition of a Theosophist:

> He who does not practice altruism: he who is not prepared to

> share his last morsel with a weaker or poorer than himself: he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery: he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defense as he would undertake his own—IS NO THEOSOPHIST.

The Christ or the Buddha who is able to strike a balance between mercy and justice may know whom to relieve of suffering and whom to leave in the mire that is their best teacher. Few mortals, however, possess such discrimination, and thus they make mistakes. It is a fact, confirmed by social workers in large cities and by those who have learned at first hand something of the mystery of the human heart, that kindness and gentle treatment will sometimes bring out the worst qualities of men and women—qualities which had been held in check by trial and hardship. It is also true, as verified by practical philanthropists, that people who have led fairly presentable lives when kept down by pain and despair, often lose their moral and mental balance when relieved prematurely of their difficulties.

Yet if mankind could once be freed from the misunderstood Mosaic doctrine of an eye for an eye, which people think gives them the right to punish, and would substitute in its stead a reverent regard for the all-wise, all-merciful Law of Karma, which no man can bribe, an era of peace and enlightenment would undoubtedly dawn for the whole human race. Is it conceivable that a great Adept like Moses would teach men to retaliate, one upon the other, by exacting an eye for an eye? Is it not more logical to suppose that he referred to Karma, and meant that the impersonal Law demands such equal retribution? With the conviction that retribution from the Law is certain and unfailing, and that each gets his dues, victims of seeming injustice would see the folly of retaliation, and would understand Jesus' admonition to turn the other cheek. Thoughtful men would understand that nothing can come to any individual, whether good or evil, except as the result of his own causation. If a person is innocent, no priest or preacher can damn; if guilty no prayers or paid-for "indulgences" can save!

Is it possible that men could live together on the basis of Jesus' law of love, mercy, and forgiveness? Is it conceivable that national and international relations could be conducted on the principle of trust and understanding? Or have the poisonous arrows of revenge, due largely to the misunderstood Biblical tradition, pierced too

deeply into the heart and consciousness of mankind? Has there ever been a nation, past or present, strong enough and courageous enough to trust Jesus' doctrine of love, a country whose leaders were convinced that morality is stronger than arms? The following Buddhist story, taken from *Buddhist Canon* (chap. 36), portrays the power of a moral position assumed, and indicates at the same time how trust and respect possess power to conquer where arms would be of no avail:

> In days of old, when Buddha was residing in the Gridhrakuta Mountains near Rajagriha with the whole assembly of the Bhikshus (disciples), 1250 in number, the King of Magadha, whose name was Ajatasatru, being then ruler of 100 kingdoms, was in perplexity as to one of them called Yue-chi, which refused to pay him tribute, although the country abounded in wealth, and was highly prosperous. On this the King sent his Prime Minister to ask Buddha what he should do, and whether he would be successful in using force against the rebellious kingdom. Having come into the presence of Buddha and put the question, the World-honoured replied: "So long as the King of the Yue-chi observes the seven rules, he will not be easily overcome." On this the minister inquired as to the character of these seven rules, to which the Master answered: (1) "So long as the people of the Yue-chi observe right rules of self-government in their several villages and communities, so long will they be able to protect themselves. (2) So long as the ministers and rulers hold together, and agree, and govern justly, so long will they be able to protect themselves. (3) So long as they, in a national view, obey the laws and submit to their direction without partiality or favor, so long will they be unconquerable. (4) So long as the Yue-chi observe the rules of decorum between man and woman, and depart not from these rules of propriety, so long will they be unconquerable. (5) So long as the Yue-chi observe the rules of reverence due to father and mother and other relations, and dutifully provide for their wants, so long will they be able to protect themselves. (6) So long as the Yue-chi religiously observe the ceremonies of the four seasons, in doing homage to heaven and earth, so long will they be unconquerable. (7) So long as the Yue-chi pay respect to all their religious teachers (Shamans), and especially to those who have come to them from afar (travellers or religious guests), and provide them with the usual necessaries, such as food, bedding, medicine, etc., so long will they be able to protect themselves. These are the seven rules. If the Yue-chi observe only one of them, it would be difficult to overpower them. How much more so if they regard the seven." And the World-honoured added these words: "Rely not too entirely on the advantage of victory (conquest), for though you may prevail in battle, yet there is still sorrow in store. Rather should a man seek the rules

of self-conquest. Having conquered himself, then there will be no further ground for birth (or continued life on earth)."

The Minister having heard these words was immediately convinced. . . . The Minister then rising from his seat begged permission to depart, and on being so permitted by Buddha, he went back to the King and told him what the Master had said. On this the King gave up all his intentions of going to war. In consequence, the Yue-chi returned to their obedience and submitted to the King.

Mercy, like charity, is one of the greatest of the virtues, according to Theosophy. But virtue alone is not enough. Man has a head as well as a heart, and before the goal is reached, these two departments of his nature—so strong in unity, so weak divided—must be taught to work together. Studying conjointly the Jewish, Christian, Greek, and Buddhist philosophies, the Alexandrian Gnostics and Theosophists seem to have achieved this blend. But with the rejection of the Gnostic element in the Church, Christian leaders ruled out philosophy, and thus could transmit to posterity only *dogmas* to be believed, instead of *propositions* to be proved, *churches* filled with followers, instead of *schools* filled with students, *blind belief* based on ignorance, instead of *faith* based on knowledge.

Karma, said Wm. Q. Judge, one of the Founders of the present Theosophical Movement, "is a beneficent law wholly merciful, relentlessly just, for true mercy is not favor but impartial justice. That which man calls Mercy and Justice is defective, errant and impure." Mercy and forgiveness, therefore, should have the highest place in that branch of Theosophy which treats of ethics as applied to human conduct. And were it not for the perfect mercifulness of Karma —which is merciful because it is just—we ought long ago to have been wiped out of existence. The very fact that the oppressor, the unjust, the wicked, live out their lives is proof of mercy in the great heart of Nature. They are thus given chance after chance to retrieve their error and climb, if even on the ladder of pain, to the height of perfection. It is true that Karma is just, because it exacts payment to the last farthing, but on the other hand it is eternally merciful, since it unerringly pays out its compensations. Nor is the shielding from necessary pain true mercy, but is indeed the opposite, for sometimes it is only through pain that the soul acquires the precise knowledge and strength it requires.

THE PERSONAL GOD IDEA

THE present cycle in human evolution, embracing a relatively short period of time, is the only one, according to Theosophy, in which the *personal-God* idea exists; for it is the only cycle in which men are so personally centered—focusing upon the *persona,* or mask. In the majority, the feeling of Self, or of "I," which should have its roots in the Soul, or collective Humanity, has been shifted to the body and lower mind, producing in each man a false conception of separateness, the notion that men *are* their warring personalities. From this false idea have arisen numberless delusions to which present-day mankind is heir—chief among these being the belief that God, like man, is a person, separate and beyond man and all life. But the early races of mankind entertained no such delusions. Their universal view is also truly contemporary, and may be expressed in this way:

> The whole Kosmos is guided, controlled and animated by almost endless series of Hierarchies of sentient Beings . . . They vary infinitely in their respective degrees of consciousness and intelligence . . . and differ morally from the terrestrial human beings on their higher (less material) spheres, only in that they are devoid of the feeling of personality and of the *human* emotional nature—two purely earthly characteristics. The term [personality] cannot of course be applied to non-human entities; but, as a fact insisted upon by generations of Seers, none of these Beings, high or low, has either individuality or personality as separate Entities, *i.e.,* they have no individuality in the sense in which a man says, *"I am myself* and no one else"; in other words, they are conscious of no such distinct separateness as men and things have on earth. Individuality is the characteristic of their respective hierarchies, not of their units . . ." (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 274-5.)

The Adept, or Mahatma, is a being who has overcome the chief delusion of separateness in personality. When the Christ or Buddha thinks "I," he thinks, not of the personality or mask he is temporarily using on earth, but of Divine Humanity, of which he feels himself to be an inseparable part. What else could Jesus have meant

when he said, "I and *my* Father are one"? What could the Master have had in mind when he said, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me," except that he had succeeded in merging his consciousness with the Hierarchy to which he belongs, and felt himself to *be* Humanity? In *The Secret Doctrine* I, 276, it is stated that—

> ". . . by paralyzing his lower personality, and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the *non-separateness* of his higher SELF from the One absolute SELF, man can, even during his terrestrial life, become as "One of Us." Thus it is, by eating of the fruit of knowledge which dispels ignorance, that man becomes like one of the Elohim or the Dhyanis; and once on *their* plane the Spirit of Solidarity and perfect Harmony, which reigns in every Hierarchy, must extend over him and protect him in every particular.

The time must come, states *The Secret Doctrine,* when the men of our race will have outgrown the feeling of personality, rendered all the wiser and happier for the transformation. Then, like the free spirits, visible and invisible, inhabiting the three regions of the Universe—the elementals, animals, angels and gods—who know no separateness and have no psychological complexes, so of man. Freed from the delusion of personality and the personal-God idea, man will need no churches, dogmas, or rituals; for every thought and act will be a spontaneous and natural worship of the one true God in all. Walt Whitman seems to have felt this universal kinship when he wrote:

> I think I could turn and live with animals,
> they are so placid and self-contained,
> I stand and look at them long and long.
>
> They do not sweat and whine about their condition,
> They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins,
> They do not make me sick discussing their duty to God,
> Not one is dissatisfied, not one is demented with the
> mania of owning things,
> Not one kneels to another, nor to his kind that lived
> thousands of years ago,
> Not one is respectable or unhappy over the whole earth.

YOUTH FORUM

What is the essential nature of pain, or anguish? And what is the essence of joy? We all, of course, experience these things, but we do so automatically, and seem to have little understanding of them.

One perfectly sane approach to this question would be to fall back upon Croce's famous definition of art: that it is what we all know it to be; and perhaps, in the last analysis, there is little more to be said. Another approach, though, might be to challenge the question, asserting that "we all, of course," have had very little experience of either the most intense pain or joy; and the proof of this is that we can "sit around" and philosophize about it. But even if both these (perhaps contrary) stances have a certain validity, we will eventually find it necessary to look for a third approach—a compromise, perhaps, but a position which at least would allow room for discussion.

A stray footnote by James Agee, in *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men,* may provide one such fruitful compromise: "The essences of anguish and of joy are . . . identical: they are the explosion or incandescence resulting from the incontrovertible perception of the incredible." There appears to be real truth in this, and some significant implications. First, the thought that the essences of both are the same seems a quite striking paraphrase of *The Bhagavad-Gita*'s teaching of the kinship and inseparability of the opposites, implying an unmoving center, a perceiver which is the common source for all these perceptions. But the second half of Agee's statement seems significant, too, for it makes us suspect that if the presence of the "incredible" is essential, then anguish and joy are relative states, since they depend upon degrees of man's ignorance. For example, if we should come upon a small flower in early spring, perhaps when there is still snow on the ground, we may suddenly be filled with joy, but if so it would be primarily because it seems to us a kind of miracle, a wonderful inconsistency with all immediately apparent possibilities. Yet we must not be too ignorant either, or else, instead of anguish, we will know only discomforts and petty dis-

appointments, and instead of joy, only amusement, or at most a kind of bodily exhilaration. True anguish and true joy—these belong in their essentiality to a Job or a Lear; to those, that is, who have fought their way out of the usual human muddle and pettiness, and yet find themselves appearing as nothing when confronted with the absolutes and irreconcilables of existence itself.

But what does this imply about those even greater ones, the Adepts? Are they above such feelings, just as the extremely ignorant are below them? In some areas, it may be that they are. They are not likely, for example, to undergo agony at the confrontation with death, for living on several levels of existence at once, they would know death for the mere stage curtain that it is, and would welcome its closing for a time while they carried on their business elsewhere. We might say, then, that in such usual areas of human life as this, they would not know sharp anguish but (considering man's recalcitrant imperfection) deep sorrow, and not sharp joy but (watching the aspiration of any one human soul) deep happiness.

And yet we must avoid being too schematic. The Adepts are after all human beings; and probably a good deal more human (in the true sense) than we know how to be. Thinking back to that flower: might it not be possible that an Adept would feel a much more acute joy at the sight of it than we could conceive of—and might he not in fact experience a powerful "shock of recognition," an understanding of just *how* incredible that flower really is?

It is only we, in our most blasphemous ignorance, who are ever bored by simple things.

Transcendence of the Opposites

The wise man will have both joy and sorrow, for nothing can be added to him or taken from him. If they are equally wise, the rich and the poor man will be equally happy; for if external goods cannot add anything to intelligible things, how can they add aught to intelligible happiness? Happiness is of the soul so that even the change of death has no power to disturb it.

—Kenneth Guthrie

THE FALL OF THE ANGELS

IF our modern philosophers, preceded by our medieval scholars, have helped themselves to more than one fundamental idea of antiquity, theologians have built their God and his Archangels, their Satan and his Angels, along with the Logos and his staff, entirely out of the *dramatis personae* of the old heathen Pantheons. They would have been welcome to these, had they not cunningly distorted the original characters, perverted the philosophical meaning, and taking advantage of the ignorance of Christendom—the result of long ages of mental sleep, during which humanity was permitted to think only by proxy—tossed every symbol into the most inextricable confusion. One of their most sinful achievements in this direction, was the transformation of the divine *alter ego* into the grotesque Satan of their theology.

In general, the so-called *orthodox* Christian conceptions about the "fallen" angels or Satan, are as remarkable as they are absurd. "Your doctrine," the Occultists are told, "makes of man, created out of the dust in the likeness of his God, a vehicle of the devil from the first." "Why did you make of your god a devil—both, moreover, created *in your own image?"* is our reply. The esoteric interpretation of the Bible, however, sufficiently refutes this slanderous invention of theology; the Secret Doctrine must some day become the just Karma of the Churches—more anti-Christian than the representative assemblies of the most confirmed Materialists and Atheists.

The amount of malicious fancy and fiction bestowed on the "Host" by various fanatical writers is quite extraordinary. The so-called Arch-Angels and Spirits of the West, copies of their prototypes, the Dhyan-Chohans, the Devas and Pitris of the East, are no real Beings but fictions. On this point Materialistic Science is inexorable. To support its position, it upsets its own axiomatic law of uniformity in the laws of nature, that of continuity, and all the logical sequence of analogies in the evolution of beings. Christian

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from *The Secret Doctrine.*

theology having arbitrarily settled and agreed that Satan with his Fallen Angels belonged to the earliest creations, Satan being the first-created, the wisest and most beautiful of God's Archangels, the word was given, the key-note struck. Henceforth all the *pagan* scriptures were made to yield the same meaning, and all were shown to be demoniacal, and it *was* and *is* claimed that *truth and fact* belong to, and commence only with Christianity.

No Theologian, any more than an Orientalist, can ever understand the genealogies of the Prajapati, the Manus, and the Rishis, nor the direct connection of these—or their correlation, rather—with the Gods, unless he has the key to the old primitive Cosmogony and Theogony, which all the Nations originally had in common. All these gods and demi-gods are found reborn on earth, in various Kalpas and in as various characters; each, moreover, having *his Karma distinctly traced, and every effect assigned to its cause.* It is not only one of most hidden secrets of Nature—that of generation, over whose solution the Embryologists have vainly put their heads together—but likewise a divine function that involves that other religious, or rather dogmatic, mystery, the "Fall" of the Angels, as it is called. Satan and his rebellious host would thus prove, when the meaning of the allegory is explained, to have refused to create physical man, only to become the direct Saviours and the Creators of *"divine* Man."

Occult symbolism furnishes the key to the mystery; theological symbolics conceal it still more. For the former explains many a saying in the Bible and even in the New Testament which has hitherto remained incomprehensible; while the latter, owing to its dogma of Satan and his rebellion, has belittled the character and nature of its would-be infinite, absolutely perfect god, and created the greatest evil and curse on earth—belief in a personal Devil. This mystery is opened with the key to its metaphysical symbolism now restored; while that of theological interpretation shows the gods and the archangels standing as symbols for the dead letter of dogmatic religions, and as arrayed against the pure truths of Spirit, naked and unadorned with fancy. It is the symbolic representation of the great struggle between divine wisdom, *nous,* and its earthly reflection, *Psuche,* or between Spirit and Soul, in Heaven and on Earth. In Heaven—because the divine MONAD had voluntarily exiled itself therefrom, to descend, for incarnating purposes, to a lower plane and thus transform the animal of clay *into an immortal god.* For, as

Eliphas Levi tells us, "the angels aspire to become men; for the perfect man, the man-god, is above even angels."

The symbolic teaching is more mystical than religious, it is purely scientific. . . . For, instead of remaining a mere blind, functioning medium, impelled and guided by fathomless LAW, the "rebellious" Angel claimed and enforced his right of independent judgment and will, his right of free-agency and responsibility, since man and angel are alike under Karmic Law. "And there was war in Heaven". . . . The supposed "rebels" were simply those who, compelled by Karmic law to drink the cup of gall to its last bitter drop, *had to incarnate* anew, and thus make responsible thinking entities of the astral statues projected by their inferior brethren. Some are said to have refused, because they had not in them the requisite materials—i.e., an astral body—since they were *arupa*. The refusal of others had reference to their having been Adepts and Yogis of long past preceding Manvantaras; another mystery. But, later on, as *Nirmanakayas,* they sacrificed themselves for the good and salvation of the *Monads* which were waiting for their turn, and which otherwise would have had to linger for countless ages as irresponsible, animal-like, though in appearance human, forms.

There is more than one interpretation, for there are seven keys to the mystery of the Fall. Moreover there are two "Falls" in Theology: rebellion of the Archangels and their Fall, and the "Fall" of Adam and Eve. Thus the lower as well as the higher Hierarchies are charged with a supposed crime. The word "supposed" is the true and correct term, for in both cases it is founded on misconception. Both are considered in Occultism as Karmic effects, and both belong to the law of Evolution: intellectual and spiritual on the one hand, physical and psychic on the other. The "Fall" is a universal allegory. It sets forth at one end of the ladder of Evolution the "rebellion," i.e., the action for differentiating intellection or consciousness on its various planes, seeking union with matter; and at the other, the lower end, the rebellion of matter against Spirit, or of action against spiritual inertia. And here lies the germ of an error which has had such disastrous effects on the intelligence of civilized societies over 1,800 years. In the original allegory it is matter, hence the more material angels, which was regarded as the conqueror of Spirit, or the Archangels who "fell" on this plane. "They of the flaming sword (or animal passions) had put to flight the Spirits of Darkness." Yet it is the latter who fought for the supremacy of the

conscious and divine spirituality on Earth and failed, succumbing to the power of matter. But in theological dogma we see the reverse. It is Michael, "who is like unto God," the representative of Jehovah, who is the leader of the celestial hosts—as Lucifer, in Milton's fancy, is of the infernal hosts—who has the best of Satan.

Christian Angelology is directly and solely derived from that of the Pharisees, who brought their tenets from Babylonia. The Sadducees, the real guardians of the Law of Moses, knew not of, and rejected, any angels, opposing even the immortality of the human *Soul* (not impersonal Spirit). In the Bible the only "Angels" spoken of are the "Sons of God" mentioned in Genesis vi (who are now regarded as the *Nephilim,* the Fallen Angels), and several angels in human form, the "Messengers" of the Jewish God, whose own rank needs a closer analysis than heretofore given.

Were the Gnostics so wrong in affirming that this our visible world, and especially the Earth, had been created by *lower* angels, the inferior Elohim, of which, as they taught, the God of Israel was one? These Gnostics were nearer in time to the records of the Archaic Secret Doctrine, and therefore ought to be allowed to have known better than non-initiated Christians, who took upon themselves, hundreds of years later, to remodel and *correct* what was said. The Beings, or the Being, collectively, called Elohim, who first (if ever) pronounced the cruel words, "Behold, the man is become *as one of us,* to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever . . ." must have been indeed the Ilda-baoth, the *Demiurge* of the Nazarenes, filled with rage and envy against his own creature, whose reflection created *Ophiomorphos.* In this case it is but natural—even from the dead letter standpoint—to view Satan, the Serpent of Genesis, as the real creator and benefactor, the "Harbinger of Light," bright radiant Lucifer, who opened the eyes of the automaton *created* by Jehovah, as alleged; and he who was the first to whisper: "In the day ye eat thereof ye shall be as Elohim, knowing good and evil"—can only be regarded in the light of a Saviour.

The sons of "Dark Wisdom," though identical with the Archangels which Theology has chosen to call the "Fallen," are as divine and pure and more so than all the Michaels and Gabriels so glorified in the churches. The Secret Doctrine teaches that the Fire-Devas, the Rudras, and the Kumaras, the "Virgin-Angels," (to whom Michael and Gabriel, the Archangels, both belong), the divine "Rebels"—

preferred the *curse* of *incarnation* and the long cycles of terrestrial existence and rebirths, to seeing the misery (even if unconscious) of the beings (evolved as shadows out of their Brethren) through the semi-passive energy of their *too spiritual Creators*. And of the latter it is asserted: the *Pitris* are not the ancestors of the present living men, but those of the first human kind or Adamic race; the spirits of *human* races, which, on the great scale of descending evolution, preceded our races of men, and were physically as well as spiritually, far superior to our modern pygmies.

If "man's uses of life should be such as neither to animalize nor to spiritualize, but to *humanize* Self," before he can do so he must be born *human* not angelic. Hence the tradition shows the celestial *Yogis* offering themselves as voluntary victims in order to redeem Humanity—created god-like and perfect at first—and to endow him with human affections and aspirations. To do this they had to give up their natural status and, descending on our globe, take up their abode on it for the whole cycle of the Mahayuga, thus exchanging their impersonal individualities for individual personalities—the bliss of sidereal existence for the curse of terrestrial life. This voluntary sacrifice of the Fiery Angels, whose nature was *Knowledge* and *Love,* was construed by the exoteric theologies into a statement that shows "the rebel angels hurled down from heaven into the darkness of Hell"—our Earth. Hindu philosophy hints at the truth by teaching that the *Asuras* hurled down by Siva, are only in an *intermediate state* in which they prepare for higher degrees of purification and redemption from their wretched condition; but Christian theology—claiming to be based on the rock of divine love, charity, and justice of him it appeals to as its Saviour—has invented, to enforce that claim paradoxically, the dreary dogma of hell, that Archimedean lever of Roman Catholic philosophy.

To express it in (still) clearer form, limiting the explanation to this earth only, it was the duty of the first "differentiated Egos"—the Church calls them Archangels—to imbue primordial matter with the evolutionary impulses and guide its formative powers in the fashioning of its productions. This it is which is referred to in the sentences, both in the Eastern and Western tradition—"the Angels were *commanded to create.*" After the Earth has been made ready by the *lower* and more material powers, and its three Kingdoms fairly started on their way to be "fruitful and multiply," the higher powers, the Archangels or Dhyanis, were compelled by evolutionary

Law to descend on Earth, in order to construct the crown of evolution—MAN. Thus the "Self-created and the Self-existent" projected their pale shadows; but group the Third, the Fire Angels, *rebelled and refused* to join their fellow Devas. Agreeably to esoteric interpretation, it was a self-sacrifice for the benefit of mankind. The "Rebels" would not create will-less irresponsible men, as the "obedient" angels did; nor could they endow human beings with only the temporary reflections of their own attributes; for even the latter, belonging to another and a so-much higher plane of consciousness, would leave man still irresponsible, hence interfere with any possibility of a higher progress. No spiritual and psychic evolution is possible on earth—the lowest and most material plane—for one who on that plane, at all events, is inherently *perfect* and cannot accumulate either merit or demerit. Man remaining the pale shadow of the inert, immutable, and motionless perfection, the one negative and passive attribute of the real *I am that I am,* would have been doomed to pass through life on earth as in a heavy dreamless sleep; hence a failure on this plane.

"We combat Protestants and Roman Catholics on a number of dogmatic theological beliefs of human and sectarian origin. We agree with them in their belief in Spirits and *intelligent* operative powers, though we do not worship 'Angels,' as the Roman Latinists do." It stands to reason that there must be an enormous difference in such terms as "objectivity" and "subjectivity," "materiality" and "spirituality," when the same terms are applied to different planes of being and perception.

Of the seven great divisions of Dhyan-Chohans, or Devas, there is none with which humanity is more concerned than with the *Kumaras.* Imprudent are the Christian Theologians who have degraded them into *fallen Angels,* and now call them "Satan" and Demons; as among these heavenly denizens who *refuse to create* the Archangel Michael—the greatest patron Saint of Western and Eastern Churches, under his double name of St. Michael and his supposed copy on earth, St. George conquering the DRAGON—has to be allowed one of the most prominent places. The Kumaras, the "mind-born Sons" of Brahma-Rudra (or Siva), the howling and terrific destroyer of *human passions and physical senses,* which are ever in the way of the development of the higher spiritual perceptions and the growth of the *inner* eternal man—mystically—are the progeny of Siva, the *Mahayogi,* the great patron of all the Yogis and mystics of

India. They themselves, being the "Virgin-Ascetics," refused to create the *material* man. Well may they be suspected of a direct connection with the Christian Archangel Michael, the "Virgin Combatant" of the Dragon *Apophis,* whose victim is every soul united too loosely to its immortal Spirit, the Angel who, as shown by the Gnostics, *refused to create* just as the Kumaras did.

Siva-Rudra is the Destroyer, as Vishnu is the preserver; both are the regenerators of spiritual as well as of physical nature. To live as a plant, the *seed* must die. To live as a conscious entity in the Eternity, the passions and senses of man must first DIE before the body does. "To live is to die and to die is to live," has been too little understood in the West. Siva, the *destroyer,* is the creator and the Saviour of Spiritual man, as he is the good gardener of nature. He weeds out the plants, human and cosmic, and kills the passions of the physical, to call to life the perceptions of the spiritual, man.

In the present all-material Fifth Race, the earthly Spirit of the Fourth is still strong in us; but we are approaching the time when the pendulum of evolution will direct its swing decidedly upwards, bringing Humanity back on a parallel line with the primitive third Root-Race in Spirituality. During its childhood, mankind was composed wholly of that Angelic Host, who were the indwelling Spirits that animated the monstrous and gigantic tabernacles of clay of the Fourth Race—built by (as they are now also) and composed of countless myriads of lives.

The *Arhan,* though he can see the Past, the Present, and the Future, is not yet the highest Initiate; for the Adept himself, the *initiated* candidate, becomes chela (pupil) to a higher Initiate. Three further grades have to be conquered by the Arhan who would reach the apex of the ladder of Arhatship. There are those who have reached it even in this *fifth race* of ours, but the faculties necessary for the attainment of these higher grades will be fully developed in the average ascetic only at the end of this Root-Race, and in the Sixth and Seventh. Thus there will always be Initiates and the Profane till the end of this minor Manvantara, the present *life-cycle.*

WHO KNOWS THE LAW?

> Perhaps you will better appreciate our meaning when told that in our view the highest aspirations for the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness if, in the mind of the philanthropist, there lurks the shadow of desire for self benefit or a tendency to do injustice, even when these exist unconsciously to himself.
>
> —From *A Master's Letter*

THE more one observes the working of Law in the world about, the more he feels on terms with Life. The Sun does not merely *shine*—it shines alike "on the just and the unjust."

Can we give of ourselves without reservations, as the Sun sheds its light without bounds? Working *within* man, the Law has moral implications. It is the Law of Ethical Causation, Karma.

Bounds in perception become bonds in the psychic nature, and blinders to the endless order of Life and brotherhood of Beings.

Admittedly, it is difficult to perform actions without *personal* interest in their results. This is involvement. In its crudest interpretation, it is *living in the past,* circumscribed by environment, identified with relationships, amid fears and hopes and doubts—bound fast by the "cords of Desire." Attempts to escape the past—turning one's back upon it, or erasing it from memory—will deepen the impressions, tighten the bonds. Only *knowledge* of Law, inherent in Life and rigidly just, will loosen the bonds.

How does one *know* the Law? What do the Teachers say? Knowledge results from the *practice* of brotherhood, as may be seen from the following passages:

> Hast thou attuned thy heart and mind to the great mind and heart of all mankind? For as the sacred River's roaring voice whereby all Nature-sounds are echoed back, so must the heart of him who in the stream would enter, thrill in response to every sigh and thought of all that lives and breathes. (*The Voice of the Silence*)

> Through the practice of Universal Brotherhood, the Truth in all things may be discovered. (*Letters That Have Helped Me*)

on the lookout

Language and One's "Universe"

Language, Thought, and Reality is a volume of the selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf, collected and edited posthumously by John B. Carroll and published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1956). Its value for the theosophical student lies in noting the route by which Mr. Whorf arrives at a number of ideas familiar to the student through H. P. Blavatsky's writings.

Mr. Whorf trained at M.I.T., acquiring (according to Stuart Chase in a foreword) "a laboratory approach and frame of reference." Long before psychologists had realized the importance of "meaning" in probing or explaining the intricacies of the lower mind, Mr. Whorf wrote (1927):

> One fact that stands out to a detached viewpoint, but is not stressed by any of the schools [of psychology], is the great and perhaps basic importance of the principle we denote by the word "meaning." Meaning will be found to be intimately connected with the linguistic: its principle is symbolism.

A Semanticist's Appraisal

Stuart Chase, author of *The Tyranny of Words,* a popular classic in the field of semantic analysis, shows an appreciation of Whorf's "sidedoor" approach to the non-technical aspects of language study. While *Language, Thought, and Reality* challenges the Greek formulation of eternal ideas—presumably as static in form—the symbols which language employs inevitably reflect basic psychological attitudes. When H. P. Blavatsky speaks of "one lip and one religion," she implies the possibility of an evolution wherein forms are continually refined, the hidden depth of symbolism better understood. Mr. Chase summarizes some of the implications of Whorf's study, showing that questions of philosophy and matters of linguistics cannot be separated:

> Somewhere along the line it may be possible to develop a real international language. Some day all peoples will use language at capacity, and so think much straighter than we now do.

Theoretically this might mean the end of linguistic relativity, but it would not mean the mountain had been climbed. The next great task would be to devise new forms of speech to bring us ever closer to reality, to move capacity on and up. "So far as we can envision the future, we must envision it in terms of mental growth."

Language, a Key to Metaphysics

Mr. Whorf's exhaustive study of the Hopi language supports his theory that the metaphysics of a culture lies hidden within the structure of the language. In the Hopi view, for example, "time disappears and space is altered." Mr. Whorf illustrates:

> The metaphysics underlying our own language, thinking, and modern culture (I speak not of the recent and quite different relativity metaphysics of modern science) imposes upon the universe two grand COSMIC FORMS, space and time; static three-dimensional infinite space, and kinetic one-dimensional uniformly and perpetually flowing time—two utterly separate and unconnected aspects of reality (according to this familiar way of thinking). The flowing realm of time is, in turn, the subject of a threefold division: past, present, and future.
>
> The Hopi metaphysics also has its cosmic forms comparable to these in scale and scope. It imposes upon the universe two grand cosmic forms, which as a first approximation in terminology we may call MANIFESTED and MANIFESTING (or, UNMANIFEST) or, again, OBJECTIVE and SUBJECTIVE. The objective or manifested comprises all that is or has been accessible to the senses. . . . The subjective or manifesting comprises all that we call future, BUT NOT MERELY THIS; it includes equally and indistinguishably all that we call mental—everything that appears or exists in the mind, or, as the Hopi would prefer to say, in the HEART, not only the heart of man, but the heart of animals, plants, and things, and behind and within all the forms and appearances of nature in the heart of nature . . . and in the very heart of Cosmos, itself. . . . It is the realm of expectancy, of desire and purpose, of vitalizing life, of efficient causes, of thought thinking itself out from an inner realm (the Hopian HEART) into manifestation.

Primitive and Civilized Thinking

In addition to his analysis of the Hopi, Mr. Whorf draws on the Shawnee, Mayan, Hittite languages, and finally as contrast, Sanskrit, to support his thesis. The following is especially suggestive in the light of theosophical teaching:

> We are accustomed to think of [primitive] mentality as less of a thinking mentality, as less rational, than ours. Yet many Ameri-

can Indian and African languages abound in finely wrought, beautifully logical discriminations about causation, action, result, dynamic or energic quality, directness of experience, etc., all matters of the function of thinking, indeed the quintessence of the rational. In this respect they far outdistance the European languages. . . .

So far as we can judge from the systematics of language, the higher mind or "unconscious" of a Papuan headhunter can mathematize quite as well as that of Einstein, and conversely, scientist and yokel, scholar and tribesman, all use their personal consciousness in the same dim-witted sort of way, and get into similar kinds of logical impasse.

The Mantram as a Specialized Formula-language

"In the Sanskrit," writes H. P. Blavatsky (*S.D.* I, 94), "as also in the Hebrew and all other alphabets, every letter has its occult meaning and its rationale; it is a cause and an effect of a preceding cause and a combination of these very often produces the most magical effect." Mr. Whorf provides a helpful analogy:

Somewhat analogously, the mathematical formulas that make possible the strategic arrangement of magnets and wires in the powerhouse so that, when the magnets (or rather the field of subtle forces, in and around the magnets) are set in motion, force is manifested in the way we call an electric current. We do not think of the designing of a radio station or a power plant as a linguistic process, but it is one nonetheless. The necessary mathematics is a linguistic apparatus, and, without its correct specification of essential patterning, the assembled gadgets would be out of proportion and adjustment, and would remain inert. But the mathematics used in such a case is a SPECIALIZED *formula*-language, contrived for making available a specialized type of force manifestation through metallic bodies only, namely, ELECTRICITY as we today define what we call by that name. The mantric formula-language is specialized in a different way, in order to make available a different type of force manifestation, by repatterning states in the nervous system and glands—or again rather in the subtle "electronic" or "etheric" forces in and around those physical bodies. Those parts of the organism, until such strategic patterning has been effected, are merely "innocent gadgets," as incapable of dynamic power as loose magnets and loose wires, but IN THE PROPER PATTERN they are something else again—not to be understood from the properties of the unpatterned parts, and able to amplify and activate latent forces. [The Mantram] can then SET the human organism to transmit, control, and amplify a thousandfold forces which that organism normally transmits only at unobservably low intensities.

The Supreme Linguistic Achievement

In the final chapter of *Language, Thought, and Reality,* Mr. Whorf discusses some Sanskrit terms familiar to theosophic students, indicating that linguistic analysis of the terms themselves reveals an over-arching content of philosophical thought. He makes this statement regarding the relationship of language to thinking:

> Actually, thinking is most mysterious. . . . The study of Language shows that the forms of a person's thoughts are controlled by inexorable laws of pattern of which he is unconscious. . . . And every language is a vast pattern-system, different from others, in which are culturally ordained the forms and categories by which the personality not only communicates, but also analyzes nature, notices or neglects types of relationship and phenomena, channels his reasoning, and builds the house of his consciousness.
>
> This doctrine is new to Western science, but it stands on unimpeachable evidence. Moreover, it is known, or something like it is known, to the philosophies of India and to modern Theosophy. This is masked by the fact that the philosophical Sanskrit terms do not supply the exact equivalent of my term "language" in the broad sense of the linguistic order. The linguistic order embraces all symbolism, all symbolic processes, all processes of reference and of logic.

Nama, Rupa, and Arupa

Mr. Whorf first notes that *"Manas* in a broad sense is a major hierarchical grade of world-structure—a 'manasic plane' as it is indeed explicitly called," and observes that the English "mental plane" is a less than satisfactory substitute for it. The following paragraphs show the linguistic emphasis on terms which H.P.B. discusses philosophically:

> It is said that in the plane of *Manas* there are two great levels, called *Rupa* and *Arupa* levels. The lower is the realm of "name and form," *Nama* and *Rupa.* Here "form" means organization in space ("our" three-dimensional space). This is far from being coextensive with pattern in a universal sense. And *Nama,* "name," is not language or the linguistic order, but only one level in it, the level of the process of "lexation" or of giving words (names) to parts which are thereby made to stand out in a semi-fictitious isolation. . . . Each language performs this artificial chopping up of the continuous spread and flow of existence in a different way. Words and speech are not the same thing; the patterns of sentence structure that guide words are more important than the words.

Thus the level of *Rupa* and *Nama*—shape-segmentation and vocabulary—is part of the linguistic order, but a somewhat rudimentary and not self-sufficient part. It depends upon a higher level of organization, the level at which its COMBINATORY SCHEME appears.

This is the *Arupa* level—the pattern world par excellence. *Arupa,* "formless," does not mean without linguistic form or organization, but without reference to spatial, visual shape. . . . *Arupa* is a realm of patterns that can be "actualized" in space and time in the materials of lower planes, but are themselves indifferent to space and time. Such patterns are not like the meanings of words, but they are somewhat like the way meaning appears in sentences. They are not like individual sentences but like SCHEMES of sentences and designs of sentence structure. It is within the possibilities of the "culture of consciousness" that the *Arupa* level of the "mental" plane may be contacted directly in an expansion of consciousness.

From Parochialism to Universality

Because of this relationship of language to thinking, Mr. Whorf says, "a change in language can transform our appreciation of the Cosmos." (This recalls the need H.P.B. felt to use Sanskrit terms.) Specifically, he suggests:

The lower personal mind, caught in a vaster world inscrutable to its methods, uses its strange gift of language to weave the web of Maya or illusion, to make a provisional analysis of reality and then regard it as final. Western culture has gone farthest here, farthest in determined thoroughness of provisional analysis, and farthest in determination to regard it as final. The commitment to illusion has been sealed in western Indo-European language, and the road out of illusion for the West lies through a wider understanding of language than western Indo-European alone can give. This is the "Mantra Yoga" of the Western consciousness, the next great step, which it is now ready to take. It is probably the most suitable way for Western man to begin that "culture of consciousness" which will lead him to a great illumination.

Again, through this sort of understanding of language is achieved a great phase of human brotherhood. For the scientific understanding of very diverse languages—not necessarily to speak them, but to analyze their structure—is a lesson in brotherhood which is brotherhood in the universal human principle—the brotherhood of the "Sons of Manas." It causes us to transcend the boundaries of local cultures, nationalities, physical peculiarities dubbed "race," and to find that in their linguistic systems, though these systems differ widely, yet in the order, har-

mony, and beauty of the systems, and in their respective subtleties and penetrating analysis of reality, all men are equal.

"Religious Freedom" in Canada

An item in the *Christian Century* (Oct. 14) illustrates how differently the phrase "religious freedom" may be interpreted against differing national backgrounds. While in the United States, "religious freedom" is consistently interpreted as including the freedom to have no religion, in Canada the judge of a Cayuga county court (Ontario) recently refused an application of citizenship to a Dutch-born couple on ground of "atheism"—and that because, "though they believe in the Bible as a book of rules for life on earth and 'seemed like a decent couple,' they refused to take the oath of allegiance which ends in the affirmation, 'So help me, God'." The account continues:

> The case goes to Canada's department of justice which must now decide whether it is necessary to believe in God to become a Canadian citizen. If the department of justice decides that new citizens must take the theistic oath, will the department in the next step make the ruling universal and retroactive? Or is atheism a privilege reserved for native-born Canadian citizens? For his authority Judge Leach cited the Canadian bill of rights, which states that Canada "is founded on the principle of the active supremacy of God" but which also includes the declaration that in Canada there must be freedom of religion. But, says the judge, the Canadian bill of rights "doesn't say there shall be freedom to have no religion." Doesn't the judge know that "no religion" is one of the most popular expressions of man's instinctive religious urge? Even in Canada "no religion" is professed by a substantial cult. What kind of religious freedom is this that lets a man choose A, B, or C but not D? Are the Christians of Canada so busy converting each other that they have no time to see what they can do with the genuine atheists?

Organized Christianity on Trial in Canada?

In the same issue of the *Christian Century,* an article on the growing tension in Quebec ("Quebec's 'Quiet' Revolution," by Claude de Mestral) concludes:

> In Quebec the dialogue between Roman Catholics and Protestants has progressed rapidly. Even French Protestantism, not a growing body, has proved a unique meeting point between Protestants and Roman Catholics. If Canadian Christians could get together as Christians . . . if they could learn to understand and appreciate each other better, even cooperate more freely, much could be done. . . .

> Speaking at the unique ecumenical gathering at the Roman Catholic University of Montreal during the conference on Faith and Order last July, Cardinal Léger concluded his address on "We Are One in Christ" with these words: "If the Churches do not bring this peace in the world, if they do not give witness of unity in Christ, the 20th century may well lose its opportunity of salvation." Could it be that if the Canadian churches do not attempt seriously and intelligently to help find a solution to the questions raised by separatism in Quebec, organized Christianity will have failed to justify its continued existence in Canada?

Vatican Council on Religious Freedom

Two dispatches from Vatican City (Los Angeles *Times,* Sept. 25) show an interesting difference in emphasis regarding the deliberations of the Ecumenical Council on religious liberty. The UPI dispatch, for example, reads as if there were little or no disagreement on this issue:

> It was the first time the controversial issue has been debated in an Ecumenical Council, and the first time the Roman Catholic Church has considered making a clear cut statement on the subject.
>
> According to an official summary, the declaration proclaims that religious liberty in society must be "recognized and respected by all and everywhere."
>
> It says the foundation of this liberty is "the duty and honor for man to follow the will of God, according to the dictates of conscience."

The AP report, on the other hand, states:

> Fourteen prelates from five nations Thursday assailed the stand of U.S. bishops and denounced a Vatican Ecumenical Council declaration on religious freedom.
>
> Most of the objections in St. Peter's Basilica reflected a conservative attitude in Roman Catholicism that if Catholics possess the only faith, then all other believers are in error and cannot expect full religious liberty of conscience. . . . Other council fathers from Italy, Brazil, Spain and India denounced the declaration in whole or in part. [One archbishop said]: "The declaration prefers the rights of man and his conscience to the rights of God."

Onward—Toward Accurate Measurements

The frequent revisions of formerly arbitrary definitions and measurements in scientific fields are of at least peripheral interest to the theosophic student, for such refinements are indicative of increased appreciation for the *meta*physical dimensions of physical phenom-

ena. The "atom," we know, has become, not a physical unit but virtually a metaphysical collectivity of "entities." Further, all revisions which relate to space, time, and matter, are congenial to the Leibnitzian view of the monad, as discussed extensively by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* ("Gods, Monads, and Atoms").

A column in the Los Angeles *Times* (Sept. 18) states that the World Congress on Weights and Measures will drop the earth's rotation as the official unit of time after October of this year. Scientists will then be able to tell "how long a second is at any moment," instead of "how long a second was." The account explains:

> The present official standard defines a second as one part in 31,556, 925.9747 of the year 1900. Thus, a full year must pass before its period can be measured, compared to 1900, and divided into seconds. Because 1964 is not completed, the best thing scientists can do today is tell how long a second was in 1963.
>
> The new definition of second will be the number of ticking vibrations of an atom, probably cesium. . . . These ticks can be precisely measured in most modern laboratories, so each scientist will have his own immediate standard, identical to all others, rather than compare his time measurements against calculation of a year later.
>
> The reason may seem pedantic, but to the range of sciences, from nuclear physics to astronomy, accurate time measurements are vital.

Length Unit Already Changed

The new time-standard will provide "a precision which is crucial to determining the half-life of an elusive nuclear particle." This change follows an earlier one which provided greater accuracy in measuring length. For example:

> In 1960, the international meter, a bar of platinum-iridium . . . was replaced as the standard of length by 1,553,164.13 wave lengths of light from the atom krypton-86.
>
> The meter bar was cast in 1874, and until krypton took over it had been the final arbitrator of length around the world—not only of the French meter but also the English foot, the Japanese shaku and other units.

Standard for Mass

With standards for weight, length, and mass, all physical phenomena can be measured. The standard for mass is the international kilogram—roughly 2.2 lbs. Because both the kilogram and the meter standard are "so crucial to all measurements on earth, they

are tightly guarded." The account continues:

> The chances of substituting another standard for the international kilogram seems slight at this point, but the scientists would like to find a way to do that. Mass and weight are identical under the pull of earth's gravity, but in weightless space this relation does not exist.
>
> In effect, scientists would like to change the mass standard from the kilogram to gravitational force on a magnetic field, something that even Albert Einstein failed to accomplish despite his historic unified-field formulation. . . . Einstein's ideas led to the conclusion, since proved in principle, that clocks moving at great speeds will tick more slowly—that is, the faster the clock moves, the slower time moves.
>
> This has had, in turn, philosophical implications, for, if man's body is analogous to a clock, he might age more slowly while racing along in a space ship at close to the speed of light.

It seems a shallow philosophy, however, which would equate the physical aging of man's tissues with the possibilities for soul learning through life's experiences.

Correction

The Editor of *Theosophical Notes* calls our attention to a "technical error" in our November issue, where we spoke of the "under God" phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance as a "law passed by Congress." He explains:

> Neither the original Pledge nor the amendment is a law; both are Congressional Resolutions, and neither carries a penalty for disregard *legally*.
>
> However, they carry enforcement by public opinion and disapproval which is especially strong in the case of school children and their parents. On the one hand, these resolutions cannot be reached or modified by court action because they are not laws; on the other, disregard carries extra-legal penalties which in some cases will be considerably more severe than any legal penalty which might be affixed to such an "offense." This is the insidious part of the thing. . . .